## Exhibit 2

## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE: . Case No. 22-20823-GLT

.

U LOCK INC, 5414 U.S. Steel Tower

600 Grant Street

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Debtor.

December 15, 2022

10:04 a.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF [#217] EVIDENTIARY HEARING ON AMENDED MOTION TO SELL PROPERTY FREE AND CLEAR OF LIENS UNDER SECTION 363(f).

RE: TANGIBLE AND INTANGIBLE PERSONAL PROPERTY OF THE ESTATE BEFORE HONORABLE GREGORY L. TADDONIO UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE

## APPEARANCES:

For the Debtor: Law Office of J. Allen Roth

By: J. ALLEN ROTH, ESQ. 805 S Alexandria Street

Latrobe, PA 15650

For Christine Biros: Bernstein-Burkley, P.C.

By: SARAH ELIZABETH WENRICH, ESQ.

ROBERT S. BERNSTEIN, ESQ.

601 Grant Street, 9th Floor

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

For Christine Biros, Lead Counsel in the State Court Action: The Law Firm of William E. Otto

By: WILLIAM E. OTTO, ESQ.

4027 Old William Penn Highway

P.O. Box 701

Murrysville, PA 15668

ECRO:

Hayley Smith

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. 268 Evergreen Avenue Hamilton, New Jersey 08619 E-mail: jjcourt@jjcourt.com

(609) 586-111 EXHIBIT 609) 587-3599

APPEARANCES (Cont'd):

For Shanni Snyder, Petitioning Creditor:

Grenen & Birsic, P.C. By: JOHN B. JOYCE, ESQ.

JEREMY J. KOBESKI, ESQ.

2

One Gateway Center, Suite 9W Pittsburgh, PA 15222

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCE:

Chapter 7 Trustee:

Mahady & Mahady

By: ROBERT H. SLONE, ESQ. 223 South Maple Avenue Greensburg, PA 15601

MS. WENRICH: So, Your Honor, with respect to the auction, I think it has been verified or it's in her Affidavit that the money is coming from a loan from USAAG, who was originally a bidder, and had they not been working together now, it's our position that perhaps Ms. Snyder and USAAG could have bid against each other further than my client was willing to bid, which would leave more money for the Estate, and also provide a higher recovery to all admin claims, and perhaps a higher recovery to general —— or any recovery to general unsecured creditors, which based on the sale right now, is not occurring.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, there's no -- there's no prohibition from parties working together on a bid.

MS. WENRICH: There's not a prohibition, but I think in this case, given the relationship and given the fact that we have not been given a full disclosure, I'm not sure that the evidence on the record establishes any finding of good faith. In fact, I think it questions a lot of the circumstances and would indicate, at least a potential, a high potential of bad faith or lack of good faith for 363(m) purposes.

THE COURT: So, are you prepared to put on evidence of how Ms. Snyder has not acted in good faith in this proceeding here, with respect to the bid?

MS. WENRICH: Yes, I'm -- I'm ready to call her and examine her as to how she obtained the funds and the

circumstances surrounding her relationship with USAAG.

1 |

2

3|

4

5 II

61

7

8

91

101

11

12

13

17

19

23

MR. JOYCE: And I will note, Your Honor, that she -we're responding -- Ms. Snyder is actually -- the ultimate sale was proffered by them. Although, USAAG at one time was interested, the ultimate sale that we're responding to and we outbid is the Biros' bid, so they set the terms and the process here, and she's just bidding on funds that she's been loaned.

I don't see how there's any bad faith. She didn't set this up and try to structure it in any way that, you know, slants it. In fact, if anything, we felt the terms were slanted against her and anybody else, and we raised those objections. But, I think her -- her Statement and Declaration, under penalty of perjury and Affidavit, addresses very clearly who she's getting the money from, and that it's a loan and, you know, we can -- I mean, it's -- there's -- there's nothing more 16 to it than that.

THE COURT: All right. Well, here's what I'm going to do first. I want to give some clarification of where I am on this. I mean, I'm not sure that the parties are aware, but I have a pretty high sensitivity to any funny business that goes on in my 363 sales. And as you may have seen, I wrote an opinion on it about a year or two ago in the Primel case where I found that a bidder did not act in good faith, and I actually sanctioned that bidder for their actions. So, I take that seriously and I -- I certainly will delete a good faith finding

where I think it's appropriate. But I can tell you, as I sit here right now, I'm not seeing a colorable allegation that she has acted in bad faith with respect to the auction process.

Again, I think this is coming back to trying to 5∥litigate this case like it's a multi-million dollar enterprise and this is, you know, raising issues and creating problems that aren't there. So, as I've gone through this process and we've had three sale hearings and, you know, I've had my own observations about, you know, Ms. Snyder's motivations by commencing this case and what she's done with her own Chapter 7 case.

So, I mean, you know, I've made no bones about what my thoughts are on some of those things. But, as we are dealing with the bidding process itself, I have not seen anything to date that would suggest that she was not acting in good faith in bidding for the asset or working with another entity to obtain the funding to make that bid. So, I'm not really inclined to go down this road unless there is a there there, because again we are wasting gobs of attorney time and expense going through these issues for assets that have nominal value here. So --

MR. OTTO: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes?

MR. OTTO: Pardon me. Will you indulge me for a

25 moment? I --

1

2

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

5

61

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

THE COURT: I will, and I'll note for the record, this is now a third attorney from Ms. Biros that has spoken at this hearing today, which again underscores my problem with the fact that this is being over lawyered and overmanaged.

MR. OTTO: I understand that, Your Honor, and I apologize for that, but if I -- if you'll indulge me for a moment, I just want to bring a couple things to your attention. First of all, in Ms. Snyder's 341 Hearing for her own Bankruptcy Court, she has no assets, no hard assets. She has claims to different -- but she has no hard assets. She has no She has no visible means of support. income.

She now has a 63,500 -- presumably she's going to get enough money to close on the loan. She has no way to pay that loan, and so she would be in immediate default and USAAG would have the right to come in and take it over. Your order required a full disclosure of all parties associated with it. Nobody from USAAG is here. Their mailing address is a drop box in a small town in Connecticut. We have not been able to find them as an incorporated entity in any of the 50 states. They're not authorized to do business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

So, we have every reason to believe that the real 23 bidder here is not Shanni Snyder, but rather USAAG, and while you can certainly make a decision to award it to Shanni Snyder, what's going on is not necessarily a sale to Shanni Snyder,

33

ultimately.

1

2

3

7

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And, in addition, Mr. Joyce has done a very good job of dancing around the facts, but in point of fact, I've been dealing with the Snyder family for five years in this case.  $5\,\parallel$  has not been a pleasant experience. My client has expended a 6 tremendous amount in both my fees and Mr. Bernstein's firm's fees. The long and the short of it is, Mr. Roth has admitted in open court that he hasn't been paid a dime for his service to U LOCK. If Shanni Snyder has no way to pay Mr. Joyce, then he's either working for free, or he's being paid by somebody else. He doesn't have to disclose who he is being paid for, and that's not a requirement, but the long and the short of it is, this whole exercise is an exercise intended to force Ms. Biros to continue to defend her property, and that makes this bad faith, if not -- if not in strict construct to the Bankruptcy Code, certainly in terms of reality.

MR. JOYCE: Your Honor, may I reply?

MR. OTTO: Thank you for your patience, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Just a second. I want to pull up the verification.

(Pause)

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Joyce?

MR. JOYCE: Mr. Otto's statement on conjecture, the funds are in my escrow account at my firm to consummate this She has a loan with USAAG. It has -- we have a note and she has terms of that -- of that note that she's got to deal with, but that's her private business, but you know if the Court wanted more information on that, we could give the Court more information on that, but --

THE COURT: Well, who is USAAG?

1 |

2 |

4

5

6

7 II

10

11

12

13

17

19

20

MR. JOYCE: USAAG is an investment company. -- I can -- I have -- I have a verified, certified under penalty of perjury, certified statement from them if necessary for the Court that I can provide the Court about them. summarize. Mr. Rick Bowen is the Chief Financial Officer of They maintain offices in Connecticut. USAAG. They have no ownership interest in U LOCK. They don't own stock in U LOCK, and they don't -- they're not a creditor of U LOCK. They don't have any business activity with U LOCK other than, as the Court knows, at one point they were interested in financing the Chapter 11 and have an interest in developing the property, but they don't have any relationship or affiliation with Ms. Snyder, other than now Debtor-Creditor, or any of the other parties here.

And then, you know, they learned about this property back in 2008 from another -- 2018, I'm sorry. I mean, I can provide this to the Court, but it -- it addresses who they are, and we also have a copy of the redacted note. I don't want to put the dollar amount in there because I don't want anybody to know how much he had available for bidding, but I mean I think

we're -- this goes back to the Court's initial comment, there's nothing colorable here. This is Mr. Otto raising conjecture, and he has no evidence to the other. I feel like I'm defending against something that he hasn't, you know, attacked with any concrete evidence. I'm defending a negative.

MR. OTTO: Your Honor, just advise Your Honor --MR. JOYCE: I can provide to the Court, Your Honor, under, you know, penalty of perjury, Mr. Rick Bowen, the CFO's statement, for the record.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Otto?

MR. OTTO: Your Honor, Mr. Joyce has said they're an 12 | investment company. Where are they? Number one, why -- are they incorporated anywhere? Is it a fictitious name? Are they

THE COURT: What difference does it make?

MR. OTTO: Because, Your Honor, this is a sham for them not to show up in Court. We don't know who USAAG is and the fact of the matter is --

THE COURT: Well --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 |

9 |

10

11

131

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. OTTO: -- the way it's set up --

THE COURT: -- if she got the money, though, from a family member, it would be the same question I would have, is what difference does it make? How is it altering the bidding process here?

MR. OTTO: It would be nice to know who the real

parties in interest are, Your Honor, your order requires it.

1

2

3

5 II

61

71

8

9 |

11

12

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JOYCE: The real party in interest is Ms. Shanni Snyder, sitting right here, Your Honor. And lenders, I 4 believe, don't even have to register in the State of Pennsylvania if they're going to do lending. I've dealt with that issue in the past. It's not -- I think Mr. Otto may be a little bit off on that, but --

THE COURT: I mean, the bottom line is, again, I have concerns about how the involuntary petition was orchestrated from the beginning, but as to this auction process, it's been exposed to full and fair bidding. We had the opportunity to have other parties come in. Your client had the opportunity to bid. Ms. Snyder had the opportunity to bid. We exposed the property. I'm not seeing any collusion or something else that would render this to be a not a good faith bidder based on what's being proposed at this point. You know, this is -- this is an issue of understanding better more of where the funding is coming from. I've got disclosures on that, but a lot of that's an issue for her case, as well. So, I just -- I struggle to see a there there, again. So, anything else that the parties want to raise at this point?

(No audible response)

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to make some additional findings for the record here. First is -- I have an objection from U LOCK that I indicated before that I wanted to

Case 22-20823-GLT Doc 395-2 Filed 05/26/23 Entered 05/26/23 14:09:26 Desc Exhibit 2 Page 12 of 12